



IF 2176

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/816,552
	Filing Date	March 23, 2001
	First Named Inventor	Igra
	Art Unit	2176
	Examiner Name	Hutton, Jr., William D.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	109870-130113

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Return Receipt Postcard
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.		
Signature			
Printed name	Robert C. Peck		
Date	January 11, 2006	Reg. No.	56,826

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:			
Signature			
Typed or printed name	Yvette L. Chriscaden	Date	January 11, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Attorney Reference: 109870-130113
IPG No: P103

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Igra

Application No.: 09/816,552

Filed: March 23, 2001

For: COMMON DESIGN FOR
WEB PAGES THROUGH
EMPLOYMENT OF
MASTER SPECIFICATIONS

Examiner: Hutton, Jr., William D.

Art Unit: 2176

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as **First Class Mail** in
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date:

January 11, 2006
DATE

Yvette L. Chriscaden
TYPED OR PRINTED NAME

Yvette L. Chriscaden
SIGNATURE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Dear Sir:

Appellant respectfully replies to the Examiner's answer as follows:

(A) In response to Appellant's argument that Ferrel does not disclose a
"master specification specifying a common style, a common navigation
arrangement, and common content placement for each resultant web page to be
generated," the Examiner has maintained that Ferrel does disclose such a master
specification in the form of Ferrel's collection of templates, controls, and style
sheets.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analogy. Even
assuming for the sake of argument that such a collection specifies one common
style, navigation, and content placement, Ferrel fails to teach subordinate content
specifications that reference the templates, controls, and style sheets "for style,

navigation, and content placement,” as is claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, it follows that the templates, controls, and style sheets can not serve as a master specification of the sort claimed in claim 1.

In the Answer and in the previous rejections, the Examiner identifies the content objects of Ferrel as reading upon the first and second “subordinate content specifications” of claim 1 (Answer pgs. 5 and 6). According to the Examiner, these story and photo objects, depicted as elements 462-466 in Figure 8 of Ferrel, reference “the associated control and corresponding style sheet” (Answer pg. 6) for common styling, navigation, and content placement. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a misreading of Ferrel. While Ferrel teaches story objects referencing style sheets (Ferrel, col. 19, lines 36-39), such style sheets do not provide common navigation, and are thus incapable of serving, alone, as the master specification of claim 1. To the extent that Ferrel provides any sort of navigation arrangement, such as the transitions between different page layouts cited by the Examiner (Answer pg. 5), it is the templates, controls, and content objects themselves (through hyperlinks) that provide the transitions, not the style sheets.

Ferrel, however, does not teach objects referencing “the associated control,” as asserted by the Examiner (Answer pg. 6). Rather, Ferrel teaches objects that are referenced by the controls, not objects that reference the controls. According to Ferrel, “each control delineates an area where some piece of content should be displayed. Settings on each control determine the proper place to look for the content to be displayed in that control” (col. 8, lines 52-55). Content objects are placed by the system of Ferrel into one or more containers (e.g., files), and the controls reference these containers to find and retrieve the content objects (see Ferrel, col. 9, lines 20-27). In addition to having controls reference containers which store the content objects, Ferrel also teaches including on the page layouts static links to content objects, if those objects are of the sort that will not need to be

regularly updated (col. 9, lines 47-52). Thus, Ferrel teaches both templates (page layouts) and controls that reference content objects. Nowhere, however, does Ferrel disclose content objects that reference controls.

Accordingly, neither the collection of templates, controls, and style sheets, nor any of those on its own or in sub-combination, teaches a “master specifications specifying a common style, a common navigation arrangement, and a common content placement,” the master specification being referenced by subordinate content specifications.

(B) In response to Appellant’s argument that Ferrel fails to teach a master specification specifying a common navigation arrangement, the Examiner asserts that navigation, as defined by Appellant’s Specification, has a broad meaning, encompassing “supported transitions between the web pages” (Answer pg. 5).

Appellant readily acknowledges the broad meaning given to the term “navigation” in Appellant’s Specification. Appellant’s disagreement with the Examiner, however, is not directed to the breadth of that term, but rather to the specifying of a common arrangement of navigation. Ferrel may, as the Examiner argues, support transitions between page layouts and content objects. However, Ferrel fails to disclose any common arrangement of these transitions.

In support of his contention, the Examiner cites column 18, line 63 through column 20, line 62 of Ferrel as disclosing two page layouts, “Page 1” and “Page 2” and states that Ferrel “supports transitions” between those pages. Ferrel may indeed support transitions, but this does not at all disclose, in as complete of detail as is claimed in claim 1, a “common navigation arrangement.”

Further, the Examiner states that common navigation “reads on any web page component that allows a user to navigate from one web page of a website to another web page of the website” (Answer pg. 42). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner simply provides a definition of navigation between two pages of a

web site, not a definition of a "common navigation arrangement." Rather, a common navigation arrangement such as that specified by the Applicant would require that each page have the same arrangements for transitioning to other pages that every other page referencing the master specification has. While it may indeed be possible to utilize a common navigation arrangement in conjunction with the other teachings of Ferrel, no such arrangement is explicitly or inherently disclosed by that reference.


Accordingly, Ferrel fails to teach "a master specification specifying . . . a common navigation arrangement," as is claimed in claim 1 of the present application.

Conclusion

As Applicant has set forth in the brief, the Examiner has erred in his rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejections.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.



Robert C. Peck, Reg. No. 56,826
Agent for Appellant

Date: January 11, 2006

Pacwest Center
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: (503) 222-9981,
FAX: (503) 796-2900